DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 378 947 IR 016 951

AUTHOR Jones, Sue
TITLE Educational Technology: K-12 Planning and Investments in the SREB States.
INSTITUTION Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE [94]
NOTE 42p.
AVAILABLE FROM Southern Regional Education Board, 592 Tenth Street, N.W., Atlanta, GA 30318 ($7.50; 10 percent off on 25 or more).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Computer Networks; Distance Education; Educational Finance; *Educational Planning; Educational Policy; *Educational Technology; Elementary Secondary Education; *Financial Support; Futures (of Society); Program Evaluation; *Resource Allocation; School Districts; State Departments of Education; *State Programs; Technological Advancement; Telephone Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Southern Regional Education Board; United States (South)

ABSTRACT

Educational technology planning and investment activities in the 15 states of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) area are described. Information was gathered through an informal telephone survey, brief state reports, and a recent survey of state contacts. States that currently have educational technology plans locate central authority for educational technology planning in the state department of education, and they are adopting committee structures to perform planning activities. SREB states are using several funding strategies to implement their plans, but appropriation distributions vary from state to state. Most SREB states are planning to use technology to address access and equity problems, and most are planning for the probable influence of the Goals 2000 program on technology use. Some investment parallels exist among the states, namely in the development of statewide electronic networks and distance learning programs. A number of policy issues are apparent throughout the region, particularly with respect to responsibility and school district roles. Thirteen tables present state information. An appendix contains the state survey. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 378 947

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Educational Technology

K-12 Planning and Investments in the SREB States

IR016951

Southern Regional Education Board

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John C. Norton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Educational Technology

K-12 Planning and Investments in the SREB States

Sue Jones

592 Tenth Street, N.W. • Atlanta, Georgia 30318-5790 • (404) 875-9211

SREB

Southern Regional Education Board

Table of Contents

About This Report 3

Region at a Glance 4

What Have We Learned 5

State Strategies 5

Goals of Plans 7

Parallels Among States 7

Policy Issues 8

SREB Educational Technology State Summary 10

Background Information 11

State Narratives 12

Alabama 12

Arkansas 13

Florida 14

Georgia 16

Kentucky 17

Louisiana 18

Maryland 20

Mississippi 20

North Carolina 22

Oklahoma 23

South Carolina 24

Tennessee 24

Texas 26

Virginia 28

West Virginia 29

Sources 31

Appendix: State Survey 33

About This Report

Technologies exist that have the potential to change education. In the hands of a skilled teacher, technology can be a powerful tool for improving learning. Technology can also help state leaders address some policy issues. Distance learning systems, for example, have been used to address equity concerns by helping to increase student access to educational resources.

The challenge before policymakers and educators is to answer planning and funding questions and harness the power of technology to improve education. Education leaders and policymakers need answers to these questions:

- Can technology help states reach educational objectives?
- What should a plan for technology look like?
- How can technology initiatives be funded?
- How do states assure equitable access to technology for every student?
- How do we measure the impact of technology on learning?

Although eight SREB states currently have plans for educational technology in place, planning for educational technology and investing in statewide initiatives is a fairly new exercise. Five years ago, only two SREB states had written educational technology plans. We are just now reaching a point where an objective evaluation of these plans can be made and helpful lessons learned.

This report[1], which describes educational technology planning and investment activities in the region, should assist policy makers and planners as they consider actions in their own states. This information can also encourage discussions across state lines leading to useful exchanges of information and productive collaborative efforts. This report may also help planners as they chart a vision for the future of technology in their state and a strategy for achieving it.

[1] Another source of interest may be the annual, *Educational Telecommunications: The State-by-State Analysis* by Dick Hezel (Hezel and Associates). While Hezel's report does not report investment data, it can be a helpful source on telecommunications planning for K-12 and higher education in the fifty states.

Region at a Glance

The SREB states are clearly investing in educational technology. In fiscal year 1994[2] alone, approximately $550 million[3] in legislative appropriations were available for K-12 educational technology in the SREB states. This figure more than doubles the $220 million appropriated in fiscal year 1993. Neither figure includes additional funding sources, such as federal and private grants and matching funds contributed by school districts. If states continue to expand technology initiatives as their plans propose, investments in K-12 educational technology will be even greater in the next few years. See page 11 for a table summarizing these figures.

Only five states—Arkansas, Kentucky, South Carolina, Tennessee, and West Virginia—require local school districts to match all or a portion of state appropriations. In the fiscal years FY93 and FY94, these five states leveraged an additional $78 million from local districts to help fund state educational technology initiatives.

More than half of the SREB states have completed plans to guide their investments in K-12 educational technology—Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia. Six states (Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Maryland, and Mississippi, and Oklahoma) are in the process of writing plans. At this time, Florida does not have a written plan for educational technology, although the state has several projects underway that support its state educational reform and accountability legislation, *Blueprint 2000*.

[2] In our survey, states were asked to provide budgetary information for fiscal year 1993 (covering the period July 1, 1992 through June 30, 1993) and fiscal year 1994 (covering the period July 1, 1993 through June 30, 1994). Sections of this report may abbreviate a fiscal year as FY9-.

[3] Numbers in this report have been rounded.

What Have We Learned?

A survey of planning and investment activity can be a useful exercise. In particular, this study reveals:

- Strategies states are using to plan for and invest in educational technology;
- Goals of current plans;
- Parallels among states;
- Policy issues.

State Strategies

Planning

Several trends emerge from an examination of the way states are planning for and investing in educational technology. First, all states that currently have state educational technology plans locate central authority for educational technology planning in the state department of education. Only one state without a written state plan (Florida) has a central authority for educational technology.

Second, SREB states are adopting a committee structure to perform planning activities. Every SREB state has used a committee structure at some point to plan for educational technology. Mississippi, for example, has legislation requiring a planning committee and defining the types of individuals who will serve as members. A natural effect of using a committee to plan is that more stakeholders and communities of interest can be involved in decisions about educational technology. A typical planning committee includes representatives from the legislature, the community, industry, and both higher education and K-12 education.

Funding

States are using several funding strategies to implement their plans. The ways state appropriations are distributed vary from state to state and from project to project. Some SREB states distribute money to schools and school districts to carry out local plans; others use state funds to directly support statewide technology projects but do not distribute funds to schools or school districts. For instance, Louisiana appropriated $1.5

million in fiscal year 1994 to support a statewide distance learning network but did not distribute funds to schools or school districts specifically for general technology purchases. In Texas, however, schools receive some funding directly from the state and are able to use that money to meet local technology plans.

Eight states distribute money directly to schools using three types of strategies, many times in combination. Some states (Florida, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, Texas and West Virginia) distribute a portion or all of their appropriations according to enrollment or average daily attendance per school. Arkansas, Florida, Tennessee, Texas, and West Virginia distribute some funds through a competitive grant process. Only Georgia distributes an equal amount of funding to every school. Five states—Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Virginia—distribute technology funds in direct support of statewide projects but do not distribute funds to districts for general technology purchases.

There also appears to be a link between the existence of a state plan and the level of funding the state legislature appropriates for educational technology. States that have written state plans have received more funding than those without plans. The eight SREB states with written plans averaged about $67 million per state in legislative appropriations over the two-year period from FY93 through FY94. The remaining seven states averaged about $32 million per state during the same period.

The state of Florida, which does not have a written state plan, skews these figures. Florida's appropriation of $171 million through the two fiscal years 1993 and 1994 exceeds the appropriations of other individual states without state plans by six times or more. If Florida's appropriations were not figured into the calculation, SREB states without state plans averaged only $8 million in appropriations over the two-year period from FY93 through FY94.

It is not always clear whether money for technology was appropriated before or after a plan was written. In Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Texas, state reports indicate that the legislature made funding for educational technology contingent upon the existence or development of a written state plan. It could be argued that, in these states, a plan serves as insurance to the legislature for the money it invests in educational technology.

Goals of Plans

While all plans have the effective use of technology to improve learning as a goal, a majority of SREB states also plan to use technology to overcome access and equity problems. At least six states report equal access as a goal of their statewide technology initiatives. The Alabama legislature recently mandated that technology be considered as part of a solution to its equity lawsuit. In addition, three states—Florida, Kentucky, and Texas—have tied investments in technology specifically to state school reform outcomes or accountability legislation.

Recent federal initiatives may impact future state educational technology planning. As part of its *Goals 2000* legislation, the U.S. Department of Education is awarding grants to qualifying states for state technology planning. A prerequisite for funding is that the technology plan must support the states' *Goals 2000* plans. At this time, the impact of *Goals 2000* is unclear, although planners need to be aware of its likely influence. A number of SREB states have already received *Goals 2000* technology planning grants; however, Louisiana is the only state to submit data about its participation in this program. Louisiana's grant is discussed on page 18.

Parallels Among States

Some investment parallels exist among the states. Nine states, for example, are funding statewide electronic data networks, and five states are investing in statewide distance learning capability. In part, these decisions grow out of a common goal of state plans to increase equity and access. A less desirable parallel among states is the low level of funding for training and staff development for educational technology. Seven SREB states—Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia and West Virginia—report modest investments in technology training programs, although some are unable to report exact expenditures. Staff development in these states takes many forms ranging from instructional materials and courses to technology training centers. School districts may supplement staff training with local funds, but states have little information about actual district expenditures for training.

Policy Issues

While there are many state-level policy issues related to the effective use of technology in education, this discussion will be limited to those issues that emerged from SREB's survey.

One of the more complicated issues is the delineation of state and district responsibility for planning and funding educational technology. For example, which entity will be responsible for staff development? States are investing only modestly—if at all—in training teachers to use technology. Is funding for staff development the responsibility of the local district?

Similarly, who is responsible for upgrading and maintaining equipment? There is little mention of these critical issues in many plans. Yet one clear characteristic of educational technology is that it will become outdated as new and more powerful technology emerges. Should the state pay for equipment upgrades and maintenance or should local districts? And who is responsible for providing technical assistance to educators? At present, Tennessee is the only state which fully funds district level educational technology facilitators. The extent to which other states may be supporting the work of technology facilitators remains unclear. Current investment data suggests that states view staff development, maintenance, upgrading, and technical support as the responsibilities of local districts.

A related issue is local district freedom. How much freedom should local districts be given when they spend state funds? Some states issue broad guidelines for school districts to follow; others are very specific. Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Texas, for example, require local districts to submit plans for state approval before they receive funding. A related question is how state curriculum guidelines or "frameworks" are linked to state or local decisions about educational technology. State and district planners should determine responsibilities and clearly define them in state plans.

Equity issues pose many policy questions. As reported earlier, at least six SREB states (Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia) clearly plan to use technology to address equity issues; other states share this intent without stating it explicitly. Most states plan to use technology to provide equal access to educational opportunity. An example would be the delivery of Advanced Placement courses via distance learning to schools that cannot provide these courses to their students

first hand. If technology is being used to address equity concerns, then the distribution of technology dollars becomes an issue. Should a state distribute an equal amount of funding to every school district, or should funding levels be based on enrollment, capacity to use the technology effectively, relative wealth or poverty, or other criteria?

"Retrofitting" or remodeling schools to accommodate technology is another issue. Often, school facilities are not equipped to handle many of the technologies provided by the state. School buildings frequently require additional wiring and other infrastructure to support new technologies. This can be an expensive endeavor—too expensive, some argue, for some local districts to afford. Equipping schools with an adequate infrastructure to support new technologies is becoming a greater concern. States see the need to specify the responsibility for retrofitting. For example, in Florida, retrofitting is a responsibility of the district, but as part of the Florida Retrofit for Technology Project, local districts are eligible to apply for grants to rewire and reconfigure their buildings.

Several lessons can be learned from close study of a state's educational technology investments. The technology a state elects to purchase may reveal how the state chooses to define "educational technology." The projects a state funds can demonstrate its vision for technology in education. A state's level of funding can reflect its commitment to implementing technology in education within a given time frame. A state's investments in staff development reflect how well it understands the relationship between the skill of the user and the results to be expected from the hardware and software.

SREB Educational Technology State Summary

State	Plan	Legislative Appropriation (in millions of dollars) FY93	FY94
Alabama	developing	0	0
Arkansas	developing	3.3	8.5
Florida[1]	no	36.0	134.7
Georgia	yes	0	86.0
Kentucky[2]	yes	63.0 (for FY93 and FY94)	
Louisiana	developing	3.7	1.5
Maryland	developing	0	0
Mississippi[3]	developing	75.0 (in FY94 over 5 years)	
North Carolina[4]	yes	5.0	52.5
Oklahoma	developing	1.9	.9
South Carolina	yes	10.0	10.8
Tennessee	yes	0	78.1
Texas	yes	97.0	99.0
Virginia	yes	4.7	4.3
West Virginia[5]	yes	10.3	13.3

1 While Florida does not have a formal plan for technology, the state has initiated many educational technology projects with the guidance of the state Bureau of Educational Technology.

2 The Kentucky legislature appropriated $63 million for educational technology for the FY93-FY94 biennium. These funds were taken from the state's educational technology trust fund.

3 In FY94 the Mississippi legislature appropriated $75 million over five years to fund a statewide educational technology plan. This figure does not include $60 million in bonds the state is authorized to issue as part of its Accountability and Adequate Education Program Act of 1994.

4 This figure does not include $9.6 million in textbook money that could be used to purchase technology-based materials. This is the first year such materials can be purchased with textbook money in North Carolina.

5 This total has been supplied by the West Virginia Office of Technology and Information Systems. Other funds in the curricular areas (math or science) or competitive grants may also be utilized for educational technology.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Background Information

This paper reports the current status of state planning and recent investments for K-12 educational technology in each of the fifteen SREB states. Statewide initiatives funded through legislative appropriations are its focus. This information, presented in a consistent format from state-to-state, may provide decision makers with a basic understanding of the progress SREB states have made in planning for and investing in educational technology and help them to better plan for the future. Although there are many notable technology projects in the higher education arena, this report is limited to initiatives in the elementary and secondary schools.

The information in this report was gathered during informal phone conversations with state contacts, through brief state reports delivered at the February 1994 meeting of the Southern Regional Education Board's Educational Technology Advisory Group, and most recently through a survey distributed to state contacts throughout the SREB region between March and June 1994.

A copy of the survey is included as an appendix to this report. Because the survey allowed respondents flexibility in submitting additional information, state narratives vary in length and complexity. However, care was taken to present this information consistently from state-to-state. Every state narrative contains a description of the state's planning status, its budget appropriation for fiscal years 1993 and 1994 when available, and a brief description of selected statewide technology projects. Future SREB reports may be produced to describe specific projects in greater detail.

Table Abbreviations

School districts are often required to match a portion of the funds provided by grants and programs. In cases where matching funds are not required, the abbreviation "NR" has been used.

A hyphen (-) has been used when a project was not in operation during the fiscal year in question.

State Narratives

Alabama

Status of State Plan. Although the state department of education has written several plans for educational technology, none have been funded.

Educational Technology Appropriation. No funds for educational technology have been appropriated in several years. Sources believe that the legislature will decide on funding for technology in a special session to be held before the end of the summer 1994. Governor Folsom's Executive Order 19 calling for a $20 million appropriation for educational technology will be considered at this time.

Equity Lawsuit. The state of Alabama has been involved in a lengthy equity lawsuit, and the legislature is currently debating a response to the court's ruling to equalize the funding across all school districts in the state by September 30, 1994. Technology is being evaluated as a possible solution to Alabama's equity dispute. A document detailing the state department of education's position on educational technology will be one of 18 submitted in response to the judge's ruling. This position paper, to be developed by the Superintendent's Educational Reform Technology Task Force, will suggest how Alabama might use technology in education.

Executive Order 19. In addition to the work of the Technology Task Force, Governor Folsom, in his Executive Order 19, set up a special committee to investigate the potential for electronic classrooms. In this order, Governor Folsom asked the legislature for $10 million to fund 105 pilot electronic classroom sites throughout the state and an additional $10 million to provide network connectivity and distance learning capabilities to 18 test schools.

Arkansas

Status of State Plan. Arkansas is currently working on its long-range plan for educational technology. Key education players from education, business, and the community have been involved in the process, and the group has developed preliminary planning pieces. Completion is expected within the 1994 year.

Educational Technology Appropriation. The Arkansas Legislature appropriated **$3.336 million** for educational technology **in FY93** and **$8.45 million in FY94**, not including appropriations for educational television. Also, Arkansas leveraged an additional $125,000 through required local district matching funds in FY94. The projects funded in FY94 and their corresponding budget allocations are listed below.

Arkansas Fiscal Year 1994

Project	Legislative Appropriation	% Match
APSCN	5,500,000	NR
Project IMPAC	2,700,000	NR
Math/science grants	250,000	50
TOTAL	**8,450,000**	

Arkansas Public School Computer Network (APSCN). The mission of the APSCN is to "implement a statewide automated information system which provides Arkansas school sites, district offices, and the Arkansas Department of Education with access to computing services which facilitate administrative decision making and support teaching and learning in the classroom." APSCN will provide school districts with access to the Internet. APSCN plans to have a strategic plan prepared by June 30, 1994. At this time, work groups composed of school-based and district-level personnel have been established to define their needs for establishing the statewide network. Based on the work of these groups, APSCN will begin a phased implementation of the network and administrative computing systems on a pilot basis in April and June of 1994. The tentative target date for complete statewide implementation has been set for August 1996.

Project IMPAC. IMPAC (Instructional Microcomputer Project for Arkansas Classrooms) Learning Systems, Inc. is a nonprofit technology service company aiding Arkansas school districts in the incorporation of microcomputers in the classroom. The Arkansas Commission on Microcomputer Instruction approves computer programs that IMPAC implements in Arkansas schools. In its first phase, IMPAC implemented 473 computer-based instructional programs which affected 300 Arkansas school districts and over 3,000 teachers and 70,000 students. Now in phase II, IMPAC's goals are replacing or redirecting the use of the current installed base of microcomputers with a new generation of networked microcomputers and providing new services and programs to school districts. (Source: *The State-by-State Analysis*, Hezel and Associates, Inc.)

Florida

Status of State Plan. Florida does not have an official state educational technology plan in place. However, the state has funded many statewide educational technology projects that have been initiated to support Florida's school reform and accountability legislation, *Blueprint 2000*.

Educational Technology Appropriation. The Florida Legislature appropriated **$36 million in FY93, $134.7 million in FY94,** and **127.9 million in FY95** for educational technology. The breakdown for FY94 follows:

Florida Fiscal Year 1994

Project	Legislative Appropriation	% Match
School Technology Incentive Awards	55,000,000	NR
Retrofit for Technology Project	30,000,000	NR
Science and technology education shared use facilities	25,000,000	NR
Science and technology education lab equipment	10,800,000	NR
State technology initiatives	8,600,000	NR
Florida Information Resource Network	5,300,000	NR
TOTAL	**134,700,000**	

School Technology Incentive Awards. Linked to Florida's Accountability Act (*Blueprint 2000*), the School Technology Incentive Awards are designed to assist schools in purchasing the technology needed to achieve their improvement goals. In order to receive an incentive award, schools must submit a proposal detailing how awards will be used "to increase the use of technology in instruction in a manner that is consistent with the school's approved school improvement plan." Proposals are submitted to the local school board, which determines the process for distributing that district's share of the funds. Thirty percent of the funds must be used for training teachers to use technology in instruction. The 1993 legislature appropriated $55 million for this project, as did the 1994 legislature.

Retrofit for Technology Project. The Florida Department of Education's Bureau of Educational Technology and the Office of Educational Facilities have established a competitive grant process to provide for the design and installation of wiring and cabling for existing schools to make use of current and future technologies "that will support each school's improvement plan." In 1992, its first year, the Retrofit Project distributed $17 million to fund 75 schools. The 1993 legislature appropriated $30 million, and the 1994 legislature has appropriated $27 million for this project.

Model Technology Schools (MTS). In 1985 the Florida Legislature passed the *Florida Model School Consortia Act* with the aim of "strengthening the public school system by establishing prototype technology schools throughout the state." Two elementary and three high schools are currently supported by this program. The MTS mission is to "experiment and conduct research on how educational technology can be most efficiently and effectively incorporated into the public schools' instructional delivery and school management." Funding for this project is provided by the state legislature, grants, and in-kind services from members of MTS coalitions.

Software Acquisition and Technology Procurement. The Department of Education has initiated an acquisition project to secure statewide contracts on K-12 software programs. These software programs are nominated by schools and school districts then selected and recommended by a statewide task force. The department has also implemented a similar effort for the acquisition of hardware. Recently, the department "finalized a contract to provide a statewide educational price for videodisc players." In addition, the Bureau of Educational Technology has established the Educational Tariff Task Force (ETTF) "to provide equitable and affordable telecommunications access to the learning technologies for all Florida students and instructional personnel."

Georgia

Status of State Plan. The Georgia Department of Education has recently developed a plan, "for the implementation of advanced instructional technology in Georgia's schools." At this time the plan calls for the implementation of instructional technology in all elementary, middle, and high schools; the development of education technology centers; and the establishment of distance learning capabilities at all school sites.

State Educational Technology Appropriation. The total budget allocation for Georgia's implementation plan for **FY94 is $85,935,478.** These funds were raised solely through the Georgia Lottery. No appropriation was made for educational technology in FY93. The FY94 appropriations are as follows:

Georgia Fiscal Year 1994

Project	Legislative Appropriation	% Match
Media center technology for elementary, middle, and high schools	38,307,500	NR
Instructional technology in elementary, middle, and high schools	32,087,500	NR
Distance learning capability at all sites	12,304,078	NR
Video distribution for elementary, middle, and high schools	1,800,000	NR
Education technology centers	1,436,400	NR
TOTAL	**85,935,478**	

Georgia Distance Learning and Telemedicine Act. The state legislature mandated that $53 million of phone company over billing be used to establish a statewide distance learning and telemedicine network. In the past year, 104 sites have been installed for interactive video. These sites include three major education agencies. By September 1994 each four-year college, university, and technical school will have a system.

Kentucky

Status of State Plan. A working document, *The Kentucky Master Plan for Educational Technology* has gone through several evaluations and revisions to meet state needs since it was established in 1990. Created in response to the Kentucky Educational Reform Act, the goal of Kentucky's Master Plan is "to bring about equitable and efficient use of technology in instruction and administration, improve teaching and learning, improve instructional outcomes for children, and enhance operation of the public school system."

Educational Technology Appropriation. The original request for the state's technology initiative was $420 million over five years; that figure has been increased to $560 million. Of this amount, $103 million has been released thus far (FY92 through FY94). The Kentucky legislature appropriated **$63 million** to be spent through the **FY93-FY94** biennium on its educational technology initiative. The state made $40 million of this amount available provided it is matched 100 percent by local school districts. As of September 9, 1994, Kentucky school districts had spent $56.3 million for direct instructional technology purchases using a 50/50 state-local match.

This list shows items purchased by school districts in FY92-FY94. It reflects only the state's share of funds.

Kentucky Fiscal Years 1992, 1993, and 1994

Project	Legislative Appropriation	% Match
Student workstations	15,551,696	100
Teacher workstations	3,761,139	100
Software	2,961,018	100
File servers	2,264,441	100
Printers	1,335,414	100
Building wiring	1,699,036	100
Other (professional development, assistance)	575,165	100
TOTAL *	**28,147,909**	**100**

* Total reflects only the portion of the FY93-FY94 educational technology appropriation spent as of September 9, 1994. Kentucky appropriated $63 million for technology in the FY93-FY94 biennium.

Kentucky Educational Reform Act. Passed in 1990, this act responded to a court's ruling that the state's educational system was inequitable. As a part of the Reform Act, the state developed the Kentucky Master Plan for Education Technology to address the issue of equity and to improve education.

Louisiana

Status of State Plan. Louisiana has begun work on a statewide educational technology plan. *Goals 2000: Educate America Act* funds will be used to finance planning efforts. The aim of the *Goals 2000 Technology Plan* is "to develop a systemic statewide plan to increase the use of state-of-the-art technologies that enhance elementary and secondary student learning and staff development." Louisiana will combine funds from its *Goals 2000* initiative, the Louisiana Quality Education Support Fund, and a National Science Foundation grant to consolidate various planning efforts.

Educational Technology Appropriation. Based on a budget recommended by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, the Louisiana legislature appropriated **$3.7 million in FY93** and more than **$1.5 million in FY94** for educational technology initiatives. The state supported its distance learning network with investments of $1.5 million in FY93 and $1.5 million in FY94 from Louisiana's Quality Education Support Fund.

Louisiana's 67 school districts also received block grants out of the Quality Education Support Fund that can be spent on educational technology. Of the $6 million in block grants appropriated in FY93, school districts chose to spend $2.2 million on educational technology programs. Actual figures are not yet available for FY94. In addition, sources believe Louisiana schools spent an undetermined amount of money from the Minimum Foundation Program for educational technology. Appropriations from this funding equalization program totaled $1.8 billion in FY94. Due to a new funding formula, the state will make $32 million in additional money available to school districts each year. The breakdown of Louisiana's educational technology investments is as follows:

Louisiana Fiscal Years 1993 and 1994

Project	1993 Legislative Appropriation	% Match	1994 Legislative Appropriation	% Match
Block grants	2,200,000	NR	???	NR
Statewide distance learning network	1,500,000	NR	1,500,000	NR
TOTAL	**3,700,000**		**1,500,000**	

Goals 2000 Technology Plan. Louisiana was awarded $77,000 of federal *Goals 2000: Educate America Act* funds to help finance its statewide educational technology planning. The educational technology plan will be integrated with Louisiana's overall School Improvement Plan to address the National Education Goals. These funds are being aligned with those from the Louisiana Quality Education Support Fund and an award from the National Science Foundation.

NSF Grant. The Louisiana Systemic Initiative Program (LaSIP) received a Networking Infrastructure for Education grant of $564,000 from the National Science Foundation.

The state plans to use this money to fund two initiatives. First, money from the NSF grant will be used to fund statewide planning. A 25-member advisory council involving representatives from various education and business communities has been established to assess the current status of educational technology in Louisiana, to develop a vision for the implementation of technology in the state, and to develop statewide technology standards. The council may call on national consultants for assistance.

Second, money from the NSF grant will be used to fund a systemic networking pilot project. As a part of this pilot project, three districts will receive access to the Internet and will be networked to each other and the state department. The goal of this project will be to develop a system for training teachers to use the Internet and to develop ways to integrate Internet resources into the math and science curriculum. If successful, this project could be replicated throughout the state.

Maryland

Status of State Plan. Maryland does not have a written state plan for educational technology at this time. However, the State Board of Education, the State Superintendent of Schools, and the Maryland Business Roundtable for Education formed a Blue Ribbon Committee with the goal of establishing a vision for technology in Maryland education. This committee first met in July 1993 and proposes to have a statewide plan for educational technology available in September 1994. The preliminary vision created by the committee states, "Every learner has the right to have access and use of information and communication resources in the classroom, workplace, home, and community."

Educational Technology Appropriation. Maryland has made no appropriations for educational technology in FY93 or FY94.

Chief of Information Technology. The state of Maryland is currently consolidating various planning efforts throughout the state for the purpose of developing a statewide plan for information technology. Responsibility for this task has been given to the newly created position of Chief of Information Technology. An executive order requires that this individual "place special emphasis on the use of telecommunications and . . . suggest ways of implementing a telecommunication 'highway' for the state, including a fiber-optic network."

Mississippi

Status of State Plan. Although Mississippi does not have an official educational technology plan in place, a council mandated by Senate Bill 3350 is required to develop a plan.

Educational Technology Appropriation. In **FY94** the Mississippi legislature appropriated **$75 million over five years** to fund a statewide educational technology plan. This money can be supplemented through bonds not to exceed $60 million. There was no appropriation for educational technology in FY93.

The Mississippi Accountability and Adequate Education Program Act of 1994. Officially known as Senate Bill 3350, the Mississippi Accountability and Adequate Education Program Act of 1994 mandates that a state council be established by July 1, 1994 for the purpose of

developing a five-year plan for the effective use of educational technology in the state. The council held its first meeting on August 4. Ultimate responsibility for the council resides with the state board of education. The council consists of representatives from such state agencies as the State Board of Education, the Institutions for Higher Learning, the Junior College and Community College Board, the State Library Commission, Mississippi Educational Television, and the Governor's appointees. As a direct result of Senate Bill 3350, $75 million was appropriated for educational technology in Mississippi by the state legislature in its April 1994 session. Senate Bill 3350 also authorizes the state to issue bonds for $60 million to fund the statewide educational technology plan.

Central Data Processing Authority (CDPA). CDPA has statutory responsibility for noncommercial data telecommunications activities in Mississippi. Currently a CDPA telecommunications task force is identifying the current and future telecommunications needs of state agencies and institutions. CDPA also serves as a facilitator in working with other agencies and institutions to develop a long-range telecommunications plan.

The Mississippi Authority for Educational Television (MAET). MAET has statutory responsibility for noncommercial video telecommunications activities in Mississippi. MAET currently serves as a facilitator in working with other agencies and institutions in developing a long-range telecommunications plan for providing educational telecommunications services to the citizens of Mississippi.

EdNet. EdNet, the result of a partnership of four Mississippi state agencies (MAET, the State Department of Education, the Mississippi State Board of Community and Junior Colleges, and the Institutions of Higher Learning), and a private partner, is a nonprofit corporation established to develop a statewide Instructional Television Fixed Service (ITFS) wireless cable network. The first ITFS cell, in Jackson, is scheduled for operation in late May 1994. Additional cells will be built to provide coverage for 95% of the population by the end of 1998.

Mississippi FiberNet 2000. Mississippi FiberNet 2000 is the world's first publicly switched interactive fiber-optic educational network. The network was placed into operation through a public/private partnership for the purposes of evaluating emerging telecommunications technologies and improving education in the rural areas of Mississippi. The network provides two-way interactive, full-motion video, audio, and high-speed Internet data communications to four public high schools (Corinth, Clarksdale, Philadelphia, and West Point), the Mississippi School

for Mathematics and Science, Mississippi University for Women, Mississippi State University (the network hub), and the Mississippi Authority for Educational Television. Fibernet 2000 delivers high school and graduate credit courses on a daily basis to students and teachers otherwise not available within selected geographic areas.

North Carolina

Status of State Plan. In spring 1994 North Carolina published and distributed copies of *A Technology Plan for North Carolina Public Schools*. One component of the plan is a basic technology funding proposal developed by the state superintendent's Instructional Technology Task Force. This plan outlines the basic hardware, software, and staff development training required to assure that all teachers and students have access to the technology needed to achieve the state's instructional goals for all students.

Educational Technology Appropriation. In **FY93** the North Carolina legislature appropriated **$5 million** for schools to purchase equipment as part of its Basic Education Program (BEP). The total appropriation for **FY94** is **$52.5* million**, as follows:

North Carolina Fiscal Year 1994

Project	Legislative Appropriation	% Match
School technology grants	42,000,000	NR
N.C. Information Highway Grants to Schools	7,000,000	NR
Instructional materials and supplies	3,500,000	NR
TOTAL	**52,500,000** *	

* These figures do not include $9.6 million in textbook money that could be used to purchase technology-based materials. This is the first year such materials can be purchased with textbook money.

In order to receive a technology grant, each system must submit a system-wide educational technology plan that is approved by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. The entire appropriation for school technology grants will be placed in an interest-bearing trust fund where the remaining funds will earn interest until all system plans meet the standards and are funded.

School Technology Commission. This commission appointed jointly by the governor and legislature will assess the state's technology needs and make recommendations for technology implementation. The commission has looked at technology's role in the broader community as well as in education. The commission contracted with an outside consultant group to conduct surveys, personal interviews, and focus groups throughout the state and to present an analysis and recommendations to the commission.

Computer Proficiency Requirement. Beginning in the year 2000, the state has mandated high school graduates satisfy a computer proficiency requirement. Students will be tested at various points throughout their school careers beginning in eighth grade. The first eighth-grade assessment is planned for 1995.

Oklahoma

Status of State Plan. Although the Oklahoma State Department of Education does not have a formal plan in place, its Instructional Technology Section is organizing a state technology task force to begin work on a plan. Sources expect the work of the group to begin by the end of summer 1994.

Educational Technology Appropriation. The following is the breakdown for the Oklahoma state educational technology budget:

Oklahoma Fiscal Years 1993 and 1994

Project	1993 Legislative Appropriation	% Match	1994 Legislative Appropriation	% Match
Small school cooperative grants	1,000,000	NR	500,000	NR
Instructional computer grants	590,000	NR	(not funded)	-
Telecommunications grants	350,000	NR	400,500	NR
TOTAL	**1,940,000**		**900,500**	

South Carolina

Status of State Plan. The Office of Instructional Technology Development in the South Carolina Department of Education is continuing work on a state technology plan. Its purpose is to provide a set of recommendations enabling the effective and efficient use of appropriate technologies to enhance the learning of all South Carolina students.

Educational Technology Appropriation. **In FY93**, South Carolina budgeted **$10 million** for educational technology. **In FY94** this amount grew to **$10.8 million** and is anticipated to grow to $14.3 million in **FY95**. **In FY93 and FY94**, South Carolina was able to leverage a total of $4.3 million from local school districts. The appropriations breakdown is as follows:

South Carolina Fiscal Years 1993 and 1994

Project	1993 Legislative Appropriation	% Match	1994 Legislative Appropriation	% Match
SC Educational TV	4,847,000	NR	5,847,000	NR
Pathways	3,750,000	25	3,450,000	25
Pathways Coordinators	1,248,000	100	1,248,000	100
Office of Instructional Technology Development	240,000	NR	240,000	NR
FrEdMail	-	-	15,000	NR
TOTAL	**10,085,000**		**10,800,000**	

Tennessee

Status of State Plan. The Tennessee Education Network (TEN) is the name given to Tennessee's major initiative to bring 21st-century technology to the state's K-12 public schools. TEN is comprised of four integrated areas of development and deployment. They are training for technology, administrative information systems, the 21st Century Classroom Project, and a statewide telecommunications network.

Educational Technology Appropriation. Tennessee has allocated a total of **$78.1 million** for educational technology for **FY94**. Local money leveraged through required matching totalled $33.3 million in FY94. The breakdown is listed below. No appropriation was made for educational technology in FY93.

Tennessee Fiscal Year 1994

Project	Legislative Appropriation	% Match
21st Century Classroom Project	53,900,000	33
Administrative Information System	11,200,000	100
Library-Internet Project	7,000,000	33
Technology Grants Program	6,000,000	33
TOTAL	**78,100,000**	

21st Century Classroom Project. With a prototype classroom costing $20,000, the 21st Century Classroom initiative will fund instructional technology to nearly 3,500 Tennessee classrooms in the current fiscal year. Some of the project's minimum instructional requirements include a fully-equipped multimedia teacher workstation, a minimum number of networkable student workstations, and a threshold instructional software purchase requirement. Tennessee has also implemented a comprehensive training program as a requirement for technology deployment in the classroom.

Another feature of the 21st Century Classroom Project is the Education Technology Grants program currently funded and being developed by the department. This program will award grants to local school systems for innovative use of instructional technology, and it will also award funds for partnerships between the state and developers to provide a source of quality instructional software, educational technology, and technology-related services.

Training for Technology. The Tennessee Department of Education is providing a comprehensive training program to 21st Century Classroom teachers based on a curriculum obtained from the state of Florida. These teachers receive 30 hours of state-provided training. Currently, the department is working with Tennessee's higher education institutions to develop pre-service educational technology training programs for future

teachers. The department is also working with local school system technology coordinators to assess their preparedness to provide technology training at the local level to additional 21st Century Classroom teachers. These same technology coordinators have received training at the state's regional centers by using an enhanced training curriculum. It is important to note that Tennessee's local school system technology coordinators are funded by the state.

Administrative Information Systems. TEN will link all school systems in the state to serve as an information management system for the schools themselves as well as for the Department of Education. Schools with existing management systems may choose to upgrade their systems to meet state electronic reporting requirements. Projects planned for coming years include financial management, personnel/payroll systems, library management, and other management systems.

Statewide Telecommunications Network. A statewide network will tie all components together and provide teachers, administrators, students, and state staff with an administrative, instructional, and professional telecommunications network. The Library-Internet Project represents the initial phase of this long-term initiative. This project will provide Internet access to all K-12 schools (libraries/media centers) and school district offices (technology coordinators). A partnership between the Tennessee Department of Education, Tennessee Board of Regents, and Vanderbilt University has been established to accommodate the required deployment, training, and operational oversight.

Texas

Status of State Plan. Titled *The Long-Range Plan for Technology (1988-2000),* this comprehensive plan, adopted by the State Board of Education in 1988, plots the course for meeting educational needs through the application of technology and for implementing concomitant changes in education through the year 2000.

Educational Technology Appropriation. For the first time in Texas history, a technology allotment, established by the 71st Texas Legislature, was made available to Texas public schools during the 1992-1993 school year. All school districts in Texas are eligible to receive funds for the purchase of technology in support of the state's goals of the *Long Range Plan for Technology (1988-2000).* The annual allotment is equal to

school districts' enrollment multiplied by $30. The Texas Legislature appropriated **$97 million in FY93, $99 million in FY94,** and **$101 million in FY95** for educational technology.

The purpose of the allotment, as stated in Texas Education Code §14.061, is to:

(1) Provide substantially equal access for students throughout the state to instruction of higher quality, to all required courses of study, and to information resources providing enrichment through the application of computers and other emerging technology;

(2) Provide substantially equal access for teachers and administrators throughout the state to teaching tools of high quality, to efficient management systems, and to instruction in using technology in the classroom that enables teachers to accomplish their daily tasks more quickly and efficiently, particularly in areas such as parent communication, curriculum planning, and interschool networking;

(3) Improve student productivity throughout the state.

To be eligible, schools must submit a five-year plan for the allotment. At least 75 percent of each school district's allotment must be used to provide classroom instructional services and programs.

The commissioner of education is authorized to deduct funds from the technology allotment for the purpose of financing statewide technology projects. Some of these projects funded in FY94 are listed below:

Texas Fiscal Year 1994

Project	Legislative Appropriation	% Match
Technology Preview Centers in regional service centers	6,000,000	NR
Texas Educational Network (TENET)	2,500,000	NR
Texas School Telecommunications Access Resource (T-STAR)	2,500,000	NR
Texas Center for Educational Technology (TCET)	400,000	NR
TOTAL *	**11,400,000**	

* This total reflects just a portion of the state's legislative appropriation totalling $99 million for FY94.

Virginia

Status of State Plan. First written in 1989, The *Six-Year Technology Plan* for Virginia has as its main goal "to reduce disparity in educational programs in public schools in the Commonwealth." Its three main objectives are equity, excellence, and connections.

Educational Technology Appropriation. In the **FY93-FY94** biennium, the Virginia legislature appropriated **$17.6 million** for educational technology. These funds were distributed as follows:

Virginia Fiscal Years 1993 and 1994

Project	1993 Legislative Appropriation	% Match	1994 Legislative Appropriation	% Match
Electronic Classroom Project	2,997,658	NR	2,611,658	NR
Instructional systems	1,461,470	NR	1,461,470	NR
Tech training purchases	109,400	NR	113,700	NR
Software purchases	79,888	NR	79,888	NR
TOTAL	**4,648,416**		**4,266,716**	

Electronic Classroom Project. The Electronic Classroom Project is a distance learning program using satellite technologies. K-12 has become the state's largest user. Programs are now initiated from four school districts and received statewide. In addition to broadcasting courses, the system is also used for in-service training and information distribution. Virginia is discussing the possibility of expanding programming to include graduate and short-courses to be offered in high schools and middle schools.

Technology Inventory. The Department of Education has just completed its "inventory of resources, applications of educational technology, and courses available in the system." The study, which identifies perceived needs of teachers and technology users, will be used to guide planning for the expansion and replacement of technology in the state as well as a means for evaluating future improvements.

V-Quest Project. The National Science Foundation (NSF) is funding Virginia's V-Quest project in the amount of $8 million over four years.

The goal of the project is to ensure that every child in the state receives a quality education in mathematics and science. To help achieve the new goals of the restructured math and science curriculum, technology will be used "extensively" in the classroom, in teacher preparation, and in in-service training for certified and non-certified teachers.

VApen Network. The VApen network was established to provide public school teachers, administrators, and staff with a means for communicating and sharing ideas. The network is connected to the state's higher education network so communication can cross academic levels. Along with access to data programs on the network, registered users also receive a newsletter.

West Virginia

Status of State Plan. The West Virginia Department of Education has drafted a comprehensive statewide, multilevel technology implementation plan. Finalization is slated for summer 1994.

Educational Technology Appropriation. The West Virginia Office of Technology and Information Systems was appropriated **$10.25 million in FY93** and **$13.29 million in FY94**. West Virginia was able to leverage a total of $262,500 from local school districts in FY93 and FY94 through a required match of certain appropriations. The breakdown is described in the table on page 30.

Basic Skills Learning Computer Education Program. This program "provides hardware, software, and training for basic skills learning" for K-6th grade classrooms. According to the *Basic Skills Implementation Update*:

- Students in 584 schools and over 4,000 classrooms are involved in the program;
- 12,000 student workstations are now in use;
- Over 7,500 educators have received training (3-7 days).

West Virginia Education Information System (WVEIS). WVEIS is a statewide administrative system. Fifty-four of the 55 county offices are currently connected. At this time, 24 school districts have the finance system operational, and 50% of the student information is entered into the system statewide. The communications network created by WVEIS will connect all schools and county boards of education.

West Virginia Fiscal Years 1993 and 1994

Project	1993 Legislative Appropriation	% Match	1994 Legislative Appropriation	% Match
Basic Skills Computer Education Program	7,000,000	NR	10,000,000	NR
WVEIS	2,400,000	hook up	2,693,000	hook up
Distance learning	250,000	25	250,000	25
Curriculum Technology Resource Center	250,000	NR	200,000	50
WVMEN	150,000	NR	150,000	NR
Technology demonstration sites	150,000	25	-	
Library/media grants	50,000	NR	-	
TOTAL *	**10,250,000**		**13,293,000**	

* This total has been supplied by the Office of Technology and Information Systems. Other funds in the curricular areas (math, science) or competitive grants may also be utilized for educational technology.

Distance Learning. All West Virginia school districts currently have at least one downlink site. New awards for equipment and courses are made to schools each year.

Curriculum Technology Resource Center. Funding for the Curriculum Technology Resource Center provides teacher training and development. In August 1993, 220 teachers at 110 schools were trained to use a videodisc player. Through a partnership program, each school received a videodisc player, videodiscs, and a monitor to be used in classrooms.

West Virginia Microcomputer Electronic Network (WVMEN). Serving over 9,000 users, this statewide electronic bulletin board system was implemented in 1982.

Technology Demonstration Sites. Funding for the Technology Demonstration Sites is granted on a competitive basis. During 1990-92, $300,000 was used to fund 19 multimedia sites, while $150,000 in 1992-93 funded 11 more sites.

Sources

The following individuals provided information for this report. Their contributions are greatly appreciated.

Alabama

Barry Clemmons, Governor's Liaison for Educational Technology Advancement

Philip Feldman, Director Field Services, College of Education, University of South Alabama

Henry Hector, Executive Director, Alabama Commission for Higher Education

Gene Murphree, Education Analyst, Alabama Legislative Fiscal Office

William Wall, Director of Grants and Scholarships, Alabama Commission on Higher Education

Ron Wright, Education Technology Specialist, Alabama Department of Education

Arkansas

Bob Friedman, Director, Arkansas Public School Computer Network

Cecil McDermott, Administrator, Project IMPAC

Charles Watson, Manager Special Projects, Arkansas Department of Education

Florida

David Brittain, Chief, Bureau of Educational Technology, Florida Department of Education

Georgia

Mandy Allen, Director, Instructional Technology, Georgia Department of Education

J.B. Mathews, Associate Commissioner, Georgia Board of Regents

Kentucky

Don Coffman, Associate Commissioner, Office of Educational Technology, Kentucky Department of Education

Louisiana

John Hanley, Distance Learning Coordinator, Louisiana Department of Education

Paul Ohme, Vice President, Academic Affairs, Northeast Louisiana University

George Silbernagel, Senior Fiscal Analyst, Louisiana Legislative Fiscal Office

Claudia Townsend, Mathematics Coordinator, Louisiana Systemic Initiatives Program

Maryland

Gary Miller, Former Associate Vice President, Program Development, University of Maryland University College

Greg Talley, Specialist, Maryland Department of Education

Mississippi

Dan Brook, Executive Director, Mississippi Fibernet 2000

Phil Pepper, Assistant Commissioner, Research and Planning, Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning

Randy Sanders, Budget Analyst, Mississippi Legislative Budget Office

James Sardin, Director, Office of Innovations, Mississippi Department of Education

North Carolina

Elsie Brumback, Director, Media and Technology Services, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

Oklahoma

John P. Curran, Director, Instructional Technology, Oklahoma Department of Education

Mike Erhart, Director, Management Information Systems, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

South Carolina

Shirley McCandless, Director, Office of Instructional Technology Development, South Carolina Department of Education

Tennessee

Vic Mangrum, Chief of Technology, Office of Education Technology, Tennessee Department of Education

Texas

Geoff Fletcher, Associate Commissioner, The Texas Education Agency

Anita Givens, Senior Director, Technology Services Division, Texas Education Agency

Virginia

J. Michael Mullen, Deputy Director, Council of Higher Education for Virginia

West Virginia

Brenda Williams, Assistant Director, West Virginia Department of Education

Appendix: State Survey

SREB used the following survey to gather information for this report. Each survey included a state narrative based on information SREB had previously collected. Respondents were asked to make changes to the state narrative as necessary. Because of space limitations, the entire text of these state narratives has not been included here.

Each state has a different way of reporting financial information. For this reason, we have chosen to go directly to sources such as yourself for assistance in making sense of the various funding initiatives in your state. The total amount of money your state is spending on educational technology and the specific projects these dollars fund are of interest. This information should be limited to statewide initiatives, in other words, those projects initiated by the state department of education or the state legislature, etc. State sources would include, however, funds earmarked for such initiatives as model programs in individual schools if supported at the state level.

We would appreciate your help in answering these questions. Also, please feel free to attach any information that you think will be helpful to us.

Section 1: Legislative Appropriations

In this section, we are interested in the funding schedule of your state's legislature and not the funding schedule of specific educational institutions which are reliant on legislative appropriations. The first few questions will help us to distinguish unique funding schedules that exist within the SREB states. Should your state make appropriations on a biennium, it would be helpful if you would provide figures for isolated years where asked, if this information is available. If not, please make it clear which year (or years) you are referring to when answering the questions.

1a. Please help us define your state legislature's fiscal year by indicating below the months in which your fiscal year begins and ends. (Does it

run July to June, for example.) If your legislature works on a biennial calendar please indicate that below and also define when the biennium begins and ends for your state's legislature.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

(To insure that we receive consistent information from survey respondents, please report investment data for the years 1992-1993 in FY93 and investment data for the years 1993-1994 in FY94. Your definition above will help us determine the actual starting and ending points of your state's fiscal year.)

1b. How much TOTAL was legislatively appropriated in FY93 and FY94 for K-12 educational technology? Funds for joint K-12 and higher education projects should be reported in Section Four and will be reported under a separate heading in the findings of this survey. If there were no appropriations for educational technology in your state for these years, please skip to Section Two.

FY93 $_____FY94 $_____

1c. Are the above figures *anticipated* or *actual*? Please explain below:

FY93_____

_____

_____

FY94_____

_____

_____

1d. Were any of the above funds listed in item #1b put into a trust fund? (Please circle one answer for each FY.)

FY93: NO YES

FY94: NO YES

If YES,

1e. Please:

a) Specify the amount of the trust fund;

b) Identify the project(s), if any that are to be funded;

c) Explain how the money is to be distributed.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

1f. Was any of the money listed in item #1b appropriated on a multi-year basis? (The state of Kentucky, for example, is in the middle of a multi-year appropriation for its statewide initiative, the Kentucky Educational Technology System (KETS) that was part of the state's reform legislation.)

FY93: NO YES

FY94: NO YES

If YES,

1g. Please:

a) Name the technology project receiving the multi-year appropriation;

b) Specify the amount of the TOTAL appropriation;

c) Specify the yearly appropriation, if possible.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Below are questions related to how legislatively appropriated dollars are distributed.

1h. Is any of the money in item #1b distributed on a competitive basis?

FY93: NO YES

FY94: NO YES

If YES,

1i. Please explain below by indicating the project name(s), the amount of the appropriation(s) and the competitive process(es) used:

FY93 _____

_____

_____

FY94 _____

_____

_____

1j. Is a funding formula used to distribute any of the funds in #1b?

FY93: NO YES

FY94: NO YES

If YES,

1k. Please describe this formula below by identifying the project name(s), and describing the formula(s) used:

FY93 _____

_____

_____

FY94 _____

_____

_____

11. Please list below:

1) The names of specific educational technology projects receiving state legislatively appropriated funding in the specified fiscal year;

2) The amount of funding each project receives;

3) The percentage of the project's total budget that comes from legislative appropriations;

4) The percentage match required of localities receiving these funds. (Ex: 100% = $1 local for every $1 state) Please list the state's required match even if localities may use sources other than their budget to match the state appropriation.

FY 93

Project	Legislative Appropriation	% Budget	% Match

FY94

Project	Legislative Appropriation	% Budget	% Match

Section 2: Additional Funding Sources

2a. Please list below any other sources not covered above that are used to fund statewide educational technology initiatives in your state. An examples would include lottery proceeds. For each source please list:

1) The names of projects funded through this source;

2) How much money was used from this source to fund each project in FY93 and FY94;

3) What percent of each project's total budget comes from this source;

4) The percentage match required of localities receiving money.

Source 1: _____

	FY93			FY94		
Project	$	% of budget	% match	$	% of budget	% match

Source 2: _____

	FY93			FY94		
Project	$	% of budget	% match	$	% of budget	% match

Source 3: _____

Project	FY93 $	FY93 % of budget	FY93 % match	FY94 $	FY94 % of budget	FY94 % match

Section 3: Contact Information

This information will be used to contact you to clarify your answers, if needed. We also plan to send you a draft copy of our report so that you may verify its contents.

Name _____

Title _____

Organization _____

Address _____

Phone# _____ Fax# _____

Please check here if you have enclosed additional information: _____

Please list here the names and addresses of individuals in your state who you would like to participate in this survey:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Section 4: Additional Information

Please use the rest of this page to provide us with any additional information that you feel would be relevant to a discussion of funding for K-12 educational technology in your state and to clarify any of your answers above. This section should also be used to describe joint K-12 and higher education projects that receive funding in your state. Thank you for your assistance.